

SELECTION STATEMENT  
FOR  
RFO 8-1-2-CD-D7142

CENTER-WIDE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The proposed procurement will provide center-wide administrative services to all directorates and offices at the Marshall Space Flight Center. These administrative services will include office files/records maintenance, mail/distribution support, desktop processing, TDY travel support, security support, resume processing, forms processing, files maintenance (automated/manual), data entry, human resources transactional processing, technical writing support, human resources technical support, educational analyst support, training support, self evaluation support, court reporting, technical coordinator, and temporary management support assistance in support of programs and projects.

This effort will be procured using NASA midrange procurement procedures NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1871. The contract will be a performance-based, firm-fixed-price, indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contract with a 2-year base period and three 1-year options. Work will be more specifically defined and ordered by individual task orders issued against the basic contract.

In accordance with NFS 1871.104 and Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 5.201, this effort was synopsisized on November 21, 2001, in Fed Biz Opps and placed on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service business opportunities website. The RFO was released as a small business set-aside to industry on December 19, 2001.

Amendment No. 1 was released January 3, 2002, and provided answers to questions received to date. Amendment No. 1 also extended the closing date to January 15, 2002.

Amendment No. 2 was released January 8, 2002, and provided answers to questions received after Amendment No. 1 was posted. The closing date remained unchanged.

Amendment No. 3 was released January 14, 2002, and provided answers to questions received after Amendment No. 2 was posted. The closing date remained unchanged.

Offers were received from the following twenty-six companies:

Access Systems  
11250 Waples Mill Road  
South Tower Suite 310  
Fairfax, VA 22030

Advanced Federal Services Corporation  
P.O. Box 1219  
Madison, AL 35758-5219

Allpoints Logistics, Inc  
1150 Aviation Boulevard  
Gainesville, GA

Beowulf Corporation  
1300 Meridian Corporation Suite 69  
Huntsville, AL 35801

Bevilacqua Research Corporation  
4040 S. Memorial Parkway, Suite B2  
Huntsville, AL 35802

Briggs Field Services, Inc.  
One Northchase Park 4201 FM  
1960 West, Suite 210  
Houston, TX 77068

Business Technologies & Solutions, Inc.  
3572 Dayton-Xenia Road, Suite 210  
Beavercreek, OH 45432

Deltha/Critique  
6600 Plaza Drive, Suite 306  
New Orleans, LA 70127

Engineering Services Unlimited, Inc.  
2003 Byrd Springs Road, Suite 106  
Huntsville, AL 35802

Future Research Corporation  
555 Sparkman Drive, Suite 601  
Huntsville, AL 35816

Integrated Management Resources  
Group (IMRG), Inc.  
703 Amer Drive  
Fort Washington, MD 20744

Mainthia Technologies, Inc.  
17535 Rosbough Drive, Suite 200  
Corporate Center of Middleburg Hts.  
Cleveland, OH 44130

Military Personnel Corporation  
6059B Arlington Blvd.  
Falls Church, VA 22044

ATMS, Inc.  
4760 Tamiami Trail N., Suite 27  
Naples, FL 34103

Starzz Management Services, Inc.  
900 Doolittle Drive Suite 4A  
San Leandro, CA 94577-1029

3D Research Corporation  
4910-H Corporate Drive  
Huntsville, AL 35814

Cirrus Technology Inc.  
1300 Meridian St. Box 26  
Huntsville, AL 35801

Douglas Resources, Inc.  
4710 Auth Place, Suite 630  
Camp Springs, MD 20746

Exodus Technology Corporation  
7501 S. Memorial Parkway – Suite 101  
Huntsville, AL 35802

GRB Environmental Services, Inc.  
Eleven Penn Plaza, Suite 1026  
New York, NY 10001

Jack Weatherly's Technical Writing  
& Consulting (JTWG), Inc.  
128 Mine Lake Court, Suite 200  
Raleigh, NC 27615

McCloud & Associates, Inc.  
502 A Dexter Street  
Greenville, NC 27833

Optimum Management Systems, LLC  
1720 South Bellaire St., Suite 1207  
Denver, CO 80222

S4  
401B Breckenridge Drive SW  
Huntsville, AL 35802

StrataCom Media Training, Inc.  
P.O. Box 2222  
Huntsville, AL 35804-2222

Tai Pedro & Associates  
912 Thayer Avenue Suite 200  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

#### EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The offers were evaluated utilizing the procedures prescribed in NFS 1871 (NASA Midrange Procurement Procedures) with the evaluation conducted in two general steps:

Step One – An initial evaluation was performed to determine if all required information had been provided and that the Offeror had made a reasonable attempt to present an acceptable offer.

Step Two – All acceptable offers were evaluated against the baseline requirement (Performance Work Statement (PWS) in conjunction with the Understanding of PWS criterion) and the value characteristics to determine overall qualitative merit of the offer. Based on this evaluation, the Government had the option, depending on the specific circumstances of the offers received, to

utilize one of the following methods: (1) Make selection and award without discussions; or (2) after discussions with all finalists, afford each Offeror an opportunity to revise its offer, and then make selection.

Selection was made utilizing Best Value Selection (BVS) technique, which seeks to select an Offeror based on the best combination of price and qualitative merit of the offers submitted and reduce the administrative burden on the Offerors and the Government. BVS takes advantage of the lower complexity of Midrange procurements and defines the value characteristics, which will serve as the discriminators among offers.

BVS evaluation is based on the premise that, if all offers have approximately equal qualitative merit, award will be made to the Offeror with the lowest evaluated price. However, the Government would consider awarding to an Offeror with higher qualitative merit if the difference in price is commensurate with added value. Conversely, the Government would consider making award to an Offeror whose offer has lower qualitative merit if the price differential between it and other Offerors warrant doing so.

The RFO prescribed three evaluation factors:

1. Understanding of PWS (this criterion in conjunction with the PWS established the Government's baseline requirement as defined in NFS 1871.602)
2. Price
3. Value Characteristics

The qualitative merit of the offer (baseline requirement plus value characteristics) was approximately equal to price.

The RFO also contained descriptions of the Understanding of the PWS criterion that consisted of the following:

1. Management Approach
2. Safety and Health
3. Past Performance
4. Information Technology Security

Additionally, the following value characteristics were applicable to this procurement:

1. Program Manager and supervisory staff with extensive experience and outstanding performance record directly related to Office Administrative Services.
2. Autonomy of Program Manager to make decisions affecting contract performance.
3. Demonstrated experience in managing Government service contracts with a value greater than \$5M.
4. Demonstrated experience with contract Phase-in, including capturing incumbent personnel.
5. Demonstrated experience in managing a workforce in excess of 50 employees to include established procedures and policies for recruiting and retaining qualified personnel.
6. Demonstrated record of meeting financial obligations to include payroll, retirement plan, and accounts payable.

For the baseline requirement, offerors were given an adjective rating of either "Meets" or "Does Not Meet". For the value characteristics, offerors received one of following four adjective ratings "Significant", "Modest", "Limited", or "None". An offeror's performance risk as assessed as either "High", "Medium", or "Low".

The Buying Team developed a detailed evaluation plan that, as the Source Selection Authority (SSA), I approved prior to receipt of offers.

## EVALUATION AND DISPOSITION OF INITIAL OFFERS AND FINAL PROPOSAL REVISIONS (FIRST ROUND)

All offers were evaluated in accordance with the approved evaluation plan. None of the offerors were determined to be unacceptable. (Reference step one of evaluation procedures). Prior to completion of the Buying Team's initial evaluation, all offerors were asked to clarify their cost proposals by completing Government-provided cost forms. The initial evaluation findings of the Buying Team were presented to me on May 08, 2002. After thoroughly reviewing the findings and consulting with senior managers within the Procurement Office and the requiring organization, I established a competitive range consisting of the lowest priced Offeror that met the baseline requirement and also received the highest available adjectival rating in each of the six value characteristics, along with those lower priced Offerors that also met the baseline requirement and offered some level of added value in more than one value characteristic.

The competitive range consisted of the following five firms: Advanced Federal Services Corporation (AFSC), Allpoints Logistics, Inc. (Allpoints), Engineering Services Unlimited (ESU), Inc., Mainthia Technologies, Inc. (MTI), and S4.

On May 13, 2002, notification was sent to the nine offerors which "did not meet" the baseline requirement along with the 12 Offerors that were not selected as finalists. This notification stated that further revisions to their proposals would not be accepted along with identifying the procedures for requesting a debriefing.

On May 10, 2002, the five Offerors included in the competitive range were advised of their status and requested to provide a written response to specific questions and clarification issues identified during the evaluation of their offers. This letter established May 22, 2002, as the due date for the receipt of all written responses and also established dates for oral discussions with all Offerors.

All discussions were held on the dates scheduled. On June 7, 2002, the five Offerors were advised that discussions were completed and the due date for receipt of final proposal revisions (FPRs) was June 14, 2002.

Final proposal revisions were received from all five Offerors by the due date and were subsequently evaluated by the Buying Team. On July 16, 2002, the Buying Team presented their final evaluation findings to me. Due to the Buying Team's inability to come to a consensus on the adjectival ratings for several of the value characteristics and pricing irregularities, I approved the reopening of discussions with the five Offerors in accordance with NFS 1815.307. Reopening discussions for a second time was due to differences in understanding by the buying team of what was stated during oral discussions. Also, several other unclear areas remained that required further clarification.

On July 19, 2002, letters were sent to the five Offerors informing them of my decision to reopen discussions and requesting written responses to specific questions and clarifications issues. This letter established July 25, 2002, as a due date for the receipt of all written responses and also established dates for a second round of oral discussions with all Offerors.

All discussions were held on the dates scheduled. On August 2, 2002, the five Offerors were advised that the second round of discussions were completed and the due date for receipt of FPRs was August 12, 2002.

## EVALUATION OF FINAL PROPOSAL REVISIONS – (Second Round)

As a result of the reopening of discussion and the FPRs, –all five Offerors were able to satisfactorily resolve all outstanding questions or clarification items. The Buying Team re-evaluated the new FPRs and determined a new evaluated price for each Offeror based on revisions contained in the FPRs. The Buying Team's final evaluation findings were presented to me on August 16, 2002, and are summarized below.

Offeror	Baseline Requirement	Value Characteristics	Evaluated Price	Performance Risk
		1 2 3 4 5 6		
MTI	Meets	S <sup>S</sup> / <sub>M</sub> M S S M	\$18,176,129	Low
ESU	Meets	M S N S S L	\$18,343,935	Low
AFSC	Meets	S S S S S S	\$18,766,686	Low
Allpoints	Meets	S S N M S S	\$18,820,131	Low
S4	Meets	S S M L L S	\$20,468,633	Low

S = Significant

M = Modest

L = Limited

N = None

## DECISION

Immediately following the presentation of the Buying Team, I convened an executive session of senior advisors, along with the Buying Team, who were familiar with the RFO and who had heard the presentation. These advisors included representatives from the Customer and Employee Relations Directorate, the Office of Chief Counsel, the Defense Contract Audit Agency, and the Procurement Office. I solicited and considered their views in reaching my selection decision. We all noted at the outset that the evaluation of the proposals was comprehensive, thorough and well documented. During the presentation, I, along with others, probed the presenters on a number of points.

Based on my review of the offers submitted, I selected Mainthia Technologies, Inc. This offeror's price, both as proposed and as adjusted, was the lowest price. This price offers significant savings to the Government that are not offset by the higher adjectival ratings recorded in the value characteristics of any of the firms remaining in the competitive range.

We noted that all of the offers within the competitive range rated "Meets" for the Baseline Requirement. Also, all of the offers within the competitive range were rated as having "Low" Performance Risk. The only area other than price that revealed a basis for discriminating between these offers was the "Value Characteristics" section. In this area, I noted that Mainthia's adjectival rating of "significant/modest" for value characteristic 2 was at worst a "high" modest rating if not in fact a "low" significant. The only limitation in this area was that Mainthia's local Program Manager would consult with his headquarters office prior to finalizing decisions to terminate employment. Other than this limitation, the Program Manager would have full autonomy to make decisions affecting contract performance. Therefore, it is my determination that Mainthia should be rated "significant" for this value characteristic. With regard to Mainthia's

rating for value characteristic 3, I confirmed that, only as a result of Mainthia's subcontractor's work, could the Mainthia team meet this requirement and therefore a rating of "Modest" was appropriate. With regard to value characteristic 6, Mainthia itself could be rated as having an excellent record of meeting financial obligations. However, well over two years ago, their subcontractor had a couple of instances of not meeting their financial obligations in a timely manner. Nonetheless, Mainthia has realistic mitigation plan in place to assure that any repetition by their subcontractor, were it to occur, would not harm contract performance. Therefore, when this mitigation plan is factored in, I judge Mainthia as having a rating of "significant" for this value characteristic.

As a result of these considerations, it was my final determination that Mainthia should have five "significant" ratings and one "modest" rating in the value characteristics. Furthermore, even with the original findings of two "modest" ratings and one "significant/modest" rating, Mainthia still offers the best value to the Government based upon consideration of all the relevant factors (i.e. ratings for the baseline requirement, value characteristics, and performance risk, and the proposed and evaluated price).

Based on the above, I select Mainthia's offer for award of a contract.

 AUG 27 2002  
Stephen P. Beale  
Source Selection Authority